

the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER
AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H.R. 2614, CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT
COMPANY PROGRAM
IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill before us today is a mix of modest, but important policy changes, some unfortunate new directions in tax policy, and what can best be termed "housekeeping" items.

There is, however, one especially important provision in this bill, which is the Extraterritorial Income Exclusion, or EIE, also known as the Foreign Sales Corporation replacement. This provision, necessitated by actions taken by the European Union before the World Trade Organization, is essential to preserving the ability to compete effectively of U.S. companies and U.S. workers.

If we are to succeed and thrive in international commerce, we must not impose punitive taxes on our own competitors. Absent the EIE, our tax code would do just that.

We must be clear about this, however. While we believe our new system will be found to be WTO compliant, there are no assurances. And we will not know for some months.

I want to assure both our friends of the European Union, and our companies that are looking to the Congress to resolve this satisfactorily, that if our new system is found wanting, then the next Congress and the next Administration will work quickly to find another.

If the EIE regime is found wanting, there may be no alternative but to adopt a fully territorial tax regime. That means, in short, a U.S. tax system that only collects tax on income earned in the U.S. I, for one, would welcome this, as should all U.S. companies and their workers, because this would cause a dramatic improvement in their ability to compete internationally. It would be ironic, indeed, if the net result of the Europeans' complaint is to leave U.S. companies stronger internationally than they were before.

For now, however, I hope the Congress passes this bill, with its FSC replacement. I hope the President signs it. And I hope the WTO finds the new system satisfactory, so we can provide some certainty to our companies as to the tax law. We can then consider at a later date whether, when, or how to enact a territorial system.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BULLETPROOF VEST
PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before you today in support of S. 2413, the Bulletproof Vest Reauthorization Act of 2000. This very effective, bipartisan legislation, introduced by Senator CAMPBELL of Colorado, passed the Senate by unanimous consent and is identical to H.R. 4033, legislation which I sponsored.

As Members will recall, this chamber passed H.R. 4033, the House Bulletproof Vest Reauthorization bill, back in July of this year by an overwhelming majority vote of 413-3. At that time, I gave a more lengthy statement on the issue of bulletproof vests. Due to time constraints, I will abbreviate my remarks today.

As I have said before, I firmly believe that when a police officer is issued a badge and a gun, they should also be issued a bulletproof vest. When police officers put their lives on the line everyday protecting our neighborhoods—they deserve the highest level of protection and security, which only a bulletproof vest can provide.

I introduced the original Bulletproof Vest Authorization bill in the 105th Congress, which was signed into law by the President. This very successful and popular program authorized \$25 million each year through Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 to assist law enforcement officers in purchasing body armor. The program proved to be more popular than initially expected, and we soon found out that \$25 million each year was not adequate to fulfill the goal of providing every law enforcement officer with body armor.

The bill before us today makes three major improvements to the existing Bulletproof Vest Program. First, the authorization will be doubled from \$25 to \$50 million each year through Fiscal Year 2004. Extending the authorization is critical in enabling officers across the nation to participate in the Bulletproof Vest Program, which has been proven to save lives. Second, language was included in the bill which guarantees smaller jurisdictions a fair portion of federal funding. Finally, this legislation improves the stab-proof standard for corrections officers who depend on these vests to protect them while on the job.

The stab-proof issue is especially important to me and my District. A constituent of mine, Corrections Officer Fred Baker was stabbed to death while on duty at the Bayside State Prison. Officer Baker was not wearing a vest at the time. We can only speculate as to whether his life would have been spared had he been given an opportunity to wear a vest, but many of us believe that had he been given that opportunity, Officer Baker would be alive today and his wife and child would still have a husband and father to come home to. If Officer Baker had the chance to wear a vest, I am sure that he would not have hesitated to put that vest on.

The legislation before us today will help ensure law enforcement officers receive federal

October 28, 2000

assistance in purchasing body armor. It is critical that Members again vote in favor of this legislation.

CONCERNING VIOLENCE IN
MIDDLE EAST

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, my vote today on H. Con. Res. 426 is not a vote "against" anything. It is a vote "for" peace. I am convinced that a peaceful settlement of the long-standing differences between Israel and the Palestinian people can only be achieved through continuing the current dialogue between the parties. I also believe that the United States can play an important—and irreplaceable—role as an honest broker of peace.

Israel has been a good friend and ally to the U.S. and I support continuation of that special relationship and our long-standing commitment to her freedom and security.

However, I am also steadfast in my support of the United States' commitment to be an honest broker of peace in the Middle East.

It is because of this position that I am so uncomfortable with the tone of this resolution. While it is understandable that the House may wish to express grave concerns about the violence currently taking place in the region, those concerns must be expressed in a way that does not cause either party to doubt the United States' neutrality in the negotiations nor its commitment to achieving outcomes acceptable to both parties. This resolution does not do so.

I am equally concerned about the House's persistent efforts to intrude into the peace process from a distance. Diplomacy is a delicate endeavor. For House Members to appear to take sides would seem to undermine—rather than further—our hopes for peace. A resolution such as this seems much too blunt an instrument to deliver the outcome we all profess to desire.

ERIE CANALWAY NATIONAL
HERITAGE CORRIDOR ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, in 1995, Congressman JAMES WALSH and Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, directed the National Parks Service to study the merits of the Erie Canal System's federal designation. In 1998, the study concluded that the system did in fact have great historical significance and recommended the canal for National Heritage Corridor status. Legislation was thus drafted and presented on the House floor on October 3, 2000. I support H.R. 5375 because I too, feel that the Erie Canal represents a key component of not only New York State's history, but the history of the United States, as well.